

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 14-17 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9-13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alperovich, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,014). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to define obtaining a plurality of unique reference information and assigning a unique identifier tag to each of the unique reference information. Thus, each piece or item of reference information has its own unique identifier tag.

Alperovich, et al. discloses a message sorter that places each of the received messages into a specific bin or pigeon hole such as "priority one", "priority two" or "priority three". Alperovich, et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest assigning a unique identifier tag to each of the referenced information. Alperovich, et al. assigns multiple messages to each identifier tag. ("A stream of" column 3, line 47).

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-6, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 has been amended in a similar manner as Claim 1 and the argument presented above applies to Claim 9 also.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 9, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 10-13 and 17, which ultimately depend from Claim 9, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 14, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,014) in view of Amicangioli (U.S. Pat. No. 6,535,509). Claims 7, 8, 14, 15 and 16 ultimately depend from either Claim 1 or Claim 9. As discussed above, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and are now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 7, 8, 14, 15 and 16 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REPLY TERM

Applicant notes that on Page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that a three month shortened statutory period was set for this response which would make our response due October 30, 2004. The Office Action Summary in "Period For Reply" set a two month time period which would make our response due September 30, 2004. Since Office Actions typically provide a three month period for response, Applicant has requested a one month extension of time which Applicant believes makes this response due November 30, 2004. If a two month extension of time is required, Applicant requests

the Examiner to consider our request for extension of time a request for the two months and charge our deposit account 08-0750 for the difference in the fee.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

Dated: November 30, 2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg